

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the use of dashes in claim 1 and has rejected claims 1 through 3 given DeLuca et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,952,927) ("DeLuca") in view of Bluthgen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,636) ("Bluthgen"). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and requests reconsideration.

The Examiner, though conceding that the claims are fully compliant with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, nevertheless requests that the dashes provided in claim 1 be removed. In the spirit of expedited prosecution and as such a change is made without respect to or impact on patentability, the applicant agrees to make the requested deletion. Claim 1 as set forth in this amendment and response presents these dashes with overstriking to indicate their removal. The applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in suitable condition and form to support their allowance.

The Examiner argues that claims 1 through 3 are obvious given a combination of DeLuca with Bluthgen. In reaching this conclusion, the Examiner argues that Bluthgen teaches the presentation of only single words on a display (citing column 8, lines 16 – 19 as support for this interpretation). The applicant respectfully submits, however, that the Examiner has mischaracterized Bluthgen's teachings.

Bluthgen teaches a mechanism for presenting textual material on a small display (in particular, a 12 character display). Bluthgen is particularly concerned with handling control characters that are embedded in the textual data (control characters being non-displayed characters that control various aspects regarding how the displayable text is displayed).

Bluthgen teaches that a number of displayable characters (including spaces but excluding control characters) as equal the number of characters in the display be simultaneously displayed. In his specific examples (see, for example, FIGS. 8a, 8b, and 8c) he shows 12 consecutive displayable characters being simultaneously displayed using a 12 character display. When these 12 consecutive displayable characters happen to comprise more than one word, more than one word will be coincidentally displayed. For example, in FIG. 8a, the words "abc" and "mijkl" are displayed while FIG. 8b illustrates the display of "toon" and "erdl." Bluthgen explains this approach in detail at column 7 at lines 20 through 48.

These teachings, of course, readily permit the simultaneous display of more than one word. Indeed, as many words as may be fit into 12 character spaces (presuming Bluthgen's 12 character display) are permitted. The applicant respectfully notes that Bluthgen's approach therefore differs from the recitations of claim 1, wherein "no two words as comprise a part of the multiword text message are simultaneously displayed." When Bluthgen *can* display multiple words as comprise a part of a multiword text message, he *does*.

The Examiner's reference to Bluthgen's column 8, lines 16 – 19 are, with all due respect, misplaced. Bluthgen is referring here to a scrolling capability, and he notes that a user may be allowed to effect a continuous scroll on a character by character basis or on a word by word basis. In neither case, however, is Bluthgen suggesting that the display actually present *only* a single character (in the case of character by character scrolling) or *only* a single word (in the case of word by word scrolling). Instead, while the display continues to display in accordance with his primary teachings (i.e., multiple characters and as many words as fit within the available displayable characters), Bluthgen teaches that the display can be updated to include a next available character (for character by character scrolling) or word (for word by word scrolling).

To illustrate, sample input text might read as follows:

"To go so far is to risk too much."

An original display of 12 characters would comprise:

"To go so far"

With word by word scrolling, the next word to add is "is." This requires two characters for the word and one character for a leading space. In such a case, to effect the scrolling, the first word in the presently displayed text can be dropped along with its trailing space. Thus, with word by word scrolling, the display would next read as follows:

"go so far is"

Again, however, such word by word scrolling does not constitute the required display of only a single word at a time as an intentional limit. Instead, Bluthgen will display as many words as can be displayed given the limits of his available display.

Application No. 10/769,826
Amendment dated March 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 1, 2004

Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that neither of the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, yield a result that matches the claimed limitation of permitting only the display of single words of a multiword text message to thereby eschew the simultaneous display of two words. This being the case, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 through 3 may be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Steven G. Parmelee
Registration No. 28,790

Date: March 1, 2005

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Suite 1600
120 South LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone: (312) 577-7000
Facsimile: (312) 577-7007